

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Ronald J. Allison,

Case No. 2:22-cv-01062-JAD-EJY

Plaintiff

v.

Clark County Detention Center Food Service  
 and Health Dept., et. al.,

**Order Dismissing  
 and Closing Case**

Defendant

Plaintiff Ronald Allison brings this civil-rights lawsuit to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while detained at Clark County Detention Center. On July 7, 2022, this court instructed Allison to file a complaint that complies with Local Special Rule 2-1 and either pay the \$402 filing fee for a civil action or properly apply to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP).<sup>1</sup> The court warned Allison that this case would be dismissed and closed if he failed to file a complaint and either pay the fee or apply to proceed IFP by that deadline.<sup>2</sup> Allison neither filed an amended complaint by that deadline nor moved for an extension of time to do so. And he has not paid the filing fee or applied to proceed IFP.

The law permits a district court to dismiss an action based on a party's failure to comply with a court order.<sup>3</sup> In determining whether to dismiss an action on this ground, the court must consider: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to

---

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>3</sup> See *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint).

1 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
 2 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.<sup>4</sup>

3 The first two factors, the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the  
 4 court’s interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of the plaintiff’s claims. The  
 5 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a  
 6 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading  
 7 ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.<sup>5</sup> The fourth factor—the public policy favoring  
 8 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

9 The fifth factor requires the court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used  
 10 to correct the party’s failure that brought about the court’s need to consider dismissal.<sup>6</sup> Courts  
 11 “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but must  
 12 explore possible and meaningful alternatives.”<sup>7</sup> Because this action cannot proceed until and  
 13 unless plaintiff files an amended complaint, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting  
 14 another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only delays the  
 15 inevitable and squanders finite resources along the way. The circumstances here do not indicate  
 16 that this case will be an exception: there is no hint that Allison needs additional time nor

---

18 <sup>4</sup> *In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting  
 19 *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)).

20 <sup>5</sup> *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

21 <sup>6</sup> *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less  
 22 drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor);  
 23 *accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the  
 persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic  
 alternatives prior to disobedience of the court’s order as satisfying this element[.]” i.e., like the  
 “initial granting of leave to amend coupled with the warning of dismissal for failure to  
 comply[.]” have been “eroded” by *Yourish*).

<sup>7</sup> *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986).

1 evidence that he did not receive the court's order. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful  
2 alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

3 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, I find that they weigh in favor of  
4 dismissal. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **THIS ACTION IS DISMISSED** for failure to  
5 follow a court order. The Clerk of Court is directed to **ENTER JUDGMENT** accordingly and  
6 **CLOSE THIS CASE. No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case.**

7 Dated: September 12, 2022

8   
9 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey